

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated under M.P.E.P. § 806.04 and M.P.E.P. § 808.01, because the different inventions have different organic compounds comprised of different general formulas with regard to different Formulas 1-3 and 4-6.

However, it can be seen that the inventions of Groups I and II are related in that the polyimide precursor of the claims of Group II is used in the formation of the polyimide optical material of Group I. Therefore, it is clear that the claims of Groups I and II are related and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than two subclasses have been searched and the Patent and Trademark Office cannot reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only two subclasses.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Roland E. Martin
Registration No.48,082

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)